

**General Plan 2020
Steering Committee Meeting
June 10, 2000**

Attendees:

Margarite Morgan	Bonsall
Chuck Davis	Bonsall
Gordon Shackelford	Lakeside
Jack Phillips	Valle de Oro
Lois Jones	San Dieguito
David Odell	Hidden Meadows
Shirley Fisher	Jacumba
Larry Glavinic	Valley Center
Philip Geddes	Valley Center
Jerry Barber	Descanso
John Elliot	Descanso
John Hammond	Sweetwater
Richard Stringham	Tecate
Pat Heinig	Lake Morena/Campo
Mary Lou Quick	Borrego Springs
Tim McMaster	Crest/Dehesa/Granite Hills/Harbison Canyon
Gordon Hammers	Potrero
Vivian Osborn	Ramona
Carol Angus	Ramona
Gene Halsel	Julian
Hank Palmer	Twin Oaks
Sandra Farrell	Twin Oaks
Donna Tisdale	Boulevard
Carl Meyer	Potrero
Tom Weber	Borrego Springs
Melissa Royael	Sierra Club
Matt Adams	BIA
Jim Whalen	J. Whalen Associates
Joan Brown Kearney	Ramona

Planning Commissioners:

Bryan Woods
Leon Brooks, Jr.
Michael Beck

Staff:

Gary Pryor (DPLU)

Consultant Team:

Jonathan Smulian (WRT)

Rose Blake (DPLU)

Neal Lamontagne (DPLU)

Aaron Barling (DPLU)

Kerry Contini (DPLU)

Justin Grigg (WRT)

Bob Citrano (BRW)

First Agenda Item: Gary Pryor's presentation of the Resource Protection and Density Reduction Formula. Opened floor for discussion of protection factor for wetland.

Gordon Hammers (Potrero): What is the definition of a wetland? Does that change during wet or dry months?

Gary Pryor: Go by the federal definition.

Michael Beck (Commissioner): *discusses wetland definition*

Hank Palmer (Twin Oaks): County definition is stricter than federal, so we should go by the federal definition.

Michael Beck (Commissioner): We should not depend on the federal government as the "lowest common denominator". We need to decide how much we should protect wetlands, and whether this is a group goal.

Discussion of level of wetland protection.

Gary Pryor: We did already discuss this, didn't expect to go through the whole argument again.

Gene Halsel (Julian): Wetlands are part of an ecological chain, with harmful effects if not preserved.

Matt Adams (BIA): If you encroach on a wetland there is a mitigation ratio of 3:1.

Michael Beck (Commissioner): What do you do if there is no feasible alternative, such as road crossings? The 56 is an example. The route has been changed to avoid biological resources, and even then there is a small wetland impact. This means that even 100% protection does not mean there are no exceptions.

Carol Argus (Ramona): Ramona is a watershed area, and 100% protection is needed.

Lois Jones (San Dieguito): RPO definition is explicit about boundaries of wetlands

Larry Glavinic (Valley Center): Mitigation is a good solution as long as it occurs within the same project area

Jack Phillips (Valle de Oro): Prime motivation should be avoidance. Only for general public good, not economics, would we allow mitigation. All those exceptions are why we have lost 90% of wetlands, which aren't good places to build anyway.

Gary Pryor: *explains reduced yield and effects on net developable land.*

Jack Phillips (Valle de Oro): Yield formula is somewhat different than wetland yield. Since they are different, we should make a motion.

Gordon Hammers (Potrero): Agreed with Jack Phillips. Issue of slope and wetlands seems to be a façade to keep land from being used at all

Gary Pryor: With bulldozers we can make anything buildable but we need to consider the county's carrying capacity.

Matt Adams (BIA): Reducing yield seems unfair to private property owner. Can't build on wetland already.

Hank Palmer (Twin Oaks): Yield equation doesn't include mitigation.

Gary Pryor: Policy of avoidance, so no mitigation needed.

Motion on current mitigation ratios and 100% avoidance in same planning area.

Motion passed unanimously.

Next issue: Proposed Protection Implementation

Hank Palmer (Twin Oaks): Confused about avoidance. What procedure is in mind to avoid?

Gary Pryor: Already in RPO.

Bryan Woods (Commissioner): Yield issue a tool for avoidance.

Gary Pryor: Avoidance means put your development somewhere else. If it can't be avoided, then mitigate at ratio 3:1.

Leon Brooks, Jr. (Commissioner): Total calculated area of wetlands including the buffer?

Gary Pryor: Buffer buildable in normal circumstances but has a yield to protect wetland.

Bryan Woods (Commissioner): Buffer does not decrease yield.

John Elliot (Descanso): Questioned yield reduction with slopes.

Gary Pryor: Once you get into habitats and endangered species, yield changes drastically.

John Elliot (Descanso): Why go through this process if it is merely the same system with different terminology?

Gary Pryor: It is easier to decide densities.

Lois Jones (San Dieguito): To clarify, the buffer zone is not a part of the acreage with 100% avoidance. It is not a part of the yield determination. Does mitigation include the buffer zone?

Gary Pryor: Create wetlands, still have buffer zone when develop.

Tom Weber (Borrego): Most of these discussions involve the urban fringe, while most of the unincorporated county is agricultural.

Gordon Shackleford (Lakeside): There is a fairness issue in moving to density formula. One of the prime goals of any general plan is to reduce real estate speculation.

Vivian Osborn (Ramona): Questioned environmental constraints. Density should reflect those constraints on lot sizes to reduce yield. We should know where we are to tell landowner their yield. Buffer should be included in yield reduction.

Gordon Hammers (Potrero): Concerned that this is a one-size-fits-all. Potrero has 8 acre and larger lots. At what point does RPO become a moot point? Should RPO be considered on a 20 acre lot?

Gary Pryor: Right now we do. The next thing we need to discuss is threshold. Need to get past protection factors first, and then decide where we apply and don't apply.

Gordon Hammers (Potrero): Small lot landowners seem to be telling large lot landowners what to do. This is class warfare.

Gary Pryor: It is not the small landowners dictating anything. It is the county.

Jack Phillips (Valle de Oro): Can't accept argument of including buffer because every site is different. Size of buffer affected by many things. Can't write a predetermined set of rules.

Michael Beck (Commissioner): There are two approaches to buffer: 1) functional buffer 2) just throw in a number. This is a RPO discussion not yield.

Lois Jones (San Dieguito): By not including it in the yield, is the buffer going to be too large and create too much of a yield on the rest of the property?

Gary Pryor: It is a function of lot size.

Motion on avoidance and reduced yield as written.

Motion passed unanimously.

Look at pink sheet (slope calculations). Proposal is to come to an agreement on this and support it.

Gary Pryor: 2 issues. 1) Need to see if protection factors are OK. 2) Where do they apply? 25-50% is where real protection factor kicks in. 15% protection factor unnecessary.

Lois Jones (San Dieguito): Over 50%, why protection factor only 75%?

Gary Pryor: Can only use 25% to calculate development. Doesn't restrict where.

Hank Palmer (Twin Oaks): If no effect with 0-15% protection, why take it out? Paper simplification?

Gary Pryor: Yes it is.

Hank Palmer (Twin Oaks): Not in favor of reducing slope protection.

Gary Pryor: New density system rounds down, while old system rounded up.

Motion to accept protection factor issue.

Motion passed unanimously.

Threshold issue, 1 du/20 ac. Or 1 du/40 ac.?

Neal Lamontagne: Uses map showing areas 1 du/20 ac. and denser to display affected areas.

Gary Pryor: Higher densities need higher yield because of greater environmental impact.

David Odell (Hidden Meadows): Does this mean he won't be able to build 1 du on his lot designated 1 du/10 ac.?

Gary Pryor: 1 du is grandfathered in.

Bryan Woods (Commissioner): When does slope kick in is the question.

Gary Pryor: All county slopes have value but this looks at it per parcel.

Gordon Hammers (Potrero): RPO should apply to this area. Everyone agrees so let's move on. 1 du/10 ac.

Margarite Morgan (Bonsall): Relate to agriculture?

Gary Pryor: Just slope, land use not important.

Jack Phillips (Valle de Oro): Proposed 1 du/20 ac.

Gary Pryor: Explained what 1 du/20 ac. means. From 1 du/ac. we would not reduce yield with slope consideration. Above would reduce yield because higher densities.

Jack Phillips (Valle de Oro): Limit this to slope, not wetlands.

Gordon Hammers (Potrero): His community's 8 acre lots will be cheated. Destroying the American dream. Only the rich will be able to afford these places. Worried about amortizing.

Gary Pryor: Investors will buy for speculation.

Bryan Woods (Commissioner): Lower threshold reduces yield.

Gordon Shackleford (Lakeside): Right now if you have 18 over 50% slope, 20 ac. If cut off at 10 ac. yield, these areas of 50% slope will be 1 du/10ac. (half of current) unless put in 1 du/20 ac. category. Lay out a General Plan category based on distance of services. Unless downsizing, going to less than 20 will allow more development. Threshold no lower than 20. Slope dependence can't get to greater than 80 ac.

Jack Philips (Valle de Oro): This is too complex. Set a simple threshold with consideration that there are certain parcel sizes where shouldn't penalize the developer for steep slopes.

Bryan Woods (Commissioner): Simple solution is 20 ac. Won't penalize/downzone communities.

Gordon Shackleford (Lakeside): Simple version. If not over 20 ac., go back to 1 du/10 ac, and give slope reduction of less than .5, so can't be driven to 1 du/40 ac.

Gary Pryor: Where reduce yield and where not?

Gordon Shackleford (Lakeside): At the situation where less intense du/ac gives more du's.

Vivian Osborn (Ramona): Doesn't think that 1 du/10 ac. would occur on a steep slope anyway.

Bryan Woods (Commissioner): Suggests tentative action. Staff should come back with more information.

Motion by Gordon Shackleford (Lakeside): Should be a final action, but staff should return with information on the overlap.

Motion passed unanimously.

Next meeting set for July 8, 2000.

